

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed **January 7, 2009** (the “Office Action” or “Action”). A request for a two (2) month extension of time and the requisite fee accompany this amendment. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status:

No changes to the claims are proposed by the present paper. Thus, claims 1-31 are currently pending for further action.

Prior Art:

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,914,754 to Kori et al. (“Kori”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,133,053 to Chen (“Chen”). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites:

A method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker *and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed*; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

(Emphasis added).

Kori and Chen do not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. Kori teaches “a video signal aspect ratio conversion apparatus in which a decoder retrieves from the input video signal, an identification signal which includes partial area information of the input video signal.” (Kori, col. 2, lines 28-38). In the Kori apparatus, “[a] memory stores the input video signal and a read-address generator outputs an address to the memory corresponding to the partial area information included in the retrieved identification signal, causing the partial area information to be output as a video signal.” (*Id.*).

While Kori teaches retrieving an “identification signal” which includes partial area information of the input video signal, Kori fails to teach or suggest “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 1). In fact, Kori does not explicitly discuss a buffering process or a buffer anywhere.

The teaching in Kori most analogous to the functionality of a buffer is that of the line memory 15, 16 which “stores the input video signal.” (Kori, col. 2, lines 32-38; col. 6, lines 14-16; col. 7, lines 18-28). Nevertheless, according to Kori, “[t]he samples stored in the line memories 15 and 16 are representative values of the entire set of pixels making up the video picture.” (Kori, col. 7, lines 18-20). The use of line memory 15, 16 to store “the entire set of pixels making up the video picture” (*Id.*) cannot reasonably be construed as “excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 1). Accordingly, Kori does not teach or suggest “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at

least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (*Id.*).

The Office Action concedes that “Kori does not disclose the buffering step as claimed.” (Action, p. 2). Consequently, the Action turns to Chen, asserting that “Chen, from the similar field of endeavor, discloses an interpolating circuit including a line buffer 32.” (*Id.*) (citing to Chen, Figs. 2-4). The Action further notes that Kori teaches interpolating circuits disposed in a pipeline after aspect ratio conversion hardware. (Action, p. 2; *see also* Kori, Figs. 3A-3B). Thus, under the Examiner’s reasoning, a combination of Kori and Chen would render a system in which a line buffer stores only a cropped version of the video feed. (Action, p. 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In response, Applicant notes that, contrary to the Action’s assertions, Chen does not teach or suggest that a line buffer 32 is a component of an interpolating circuit. Rather, Chen explicitly states that the line buffer 32 referenced in the Action is a component of an “image scaling device.” (*See, e.g.*, Chen, col. 2, lines 19-26 and 35-36). According to Chen, the “image scaling device 30 is able to perform horizontal scaling and vertical scaling processes to an input image and outputs an output image.” (*Id.*, col. 2, lines 36-39). The image scaling device taught by Chen does not perform the same functions as an interpolating circuit, which maps a stream of data to rows on screen. Hence, the image scaling device is not analogous to the interpolating circuit taught by Kori, and the combination of Chen and Kori fails to teach or suggest “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 1).

Under the analysis required by *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) to support a rejection under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art must first be determined, followed by an assessment of the differences between the prior art and the claim at issue in view of the ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court has recently reaffirmed that the *Graham* factors “continue to define the inquiry that controls” obviousness rejections under § 103. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). In the present case, the scope and content of the prior art, as evidenced by Kori and Chen, did not include the claimed subject matter, particularly “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 1).

The differences between the cited prior art and the claimed subject matter are significant because the claimed subject matter automatically fits a video feed to a display device without having to store nondisplayed portions of the video feed. (See Applicant’s specification, ¶ 0004). Thus, the claimed subject matter provides features and advantages not known or available in the cited prior art. Consequently, the cited prior art will not support a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and *Graham*. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 recites:

A method for transmitting a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

adding, to the video feed, at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

transmitting the video feed to the display device;
parsing the at least one marker from the video feed;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Kori and Chen do not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 9.

Specifically, as amply demonstrated above, Kori and Chen fail to teach or suggest “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 9).

Again, under the analysis required by *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) to support a rejection under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art must first be determined, followed by an assessment of the differences between the prior art and the claim at issue in view of the ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court has recently reaffirmed that the *Graham* factors “continue to define the inquiry that controls” obviousness rejections under § 103. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). In the present case, the scope and content of the prior art, as evidenced by Kori and Chen, did not include the claimed subject matter, particularly “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 9).

The differences between the cited prior art and the claimed subject matter are significant because the claimed subject matter automatically fits a video feed to a display device without having to store nondisplayed portions of the video feed. (See Applicant’s specification, ¶ 0004). Thus, the claimed subject matter provides features and advantages not known or available in the cited prior art. Consequently, the cited prior art will not support a

rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and *Graham*. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 9 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 12:

Claim 12 recites:

A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:
a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area;
a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and
a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Kori and Chen do not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 12. Specifically, as amply demonstrated above, Kori and Chen fail to teach or suggest “a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 12).

Again, under the analysis required by *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) to support a rejection under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art must first be determined, followed by an assessment of the differences between the prior art and the claim at issue in view of the ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court has recently reaffirmed that the *Graham* factors “continue to define the inquiry that controls” obviousness rejections under § 103. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). In the present case, the scope

and content of the prior art, as evidenced by Kori and Chen, did not include the claimed subject matter, particularly “a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 12).

The differences between the cited prior art and the claimed subject matter are significant because the claimed subject matter automatically fits a video feed to a display device without having to store nondisplayed portions of the video feed. (See Applicant’s specification, ¶ 0004). Thus, the claimed subject matter provides features and advantages not known or available in the cited prior art. Consequently, the cited prior art will not support a rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and *Graham*. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 12 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 recites:

A display device for displaying a video feed, the display device comprising:
a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;
a buffer;
means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and
means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Kori and Chen do not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 16. Specifically, as amply demonstrated above, Kori and Chen fail to teach or suggest

“means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 16).

Again, under the analysis required by *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) to support a rejection under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art must first be determined, followed by an assessment of the differences between the prior art and the claim at issue in view of the ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court has recently reaffirmed that the *Graham* factors “continue to define the inquiry that controls” obviousness rejections under § 103. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). In the present case, the scope and content of the prior art, as evidenced by Kori and Chen, did not include the claimed subject matter, particularly “means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 16).

The differences between the cited prior art and the claimed subject matter are significant because the claimed subject matter automatically fits a video feed to a display device without having to store nondisplayed portions of the video feed. (See Applicant’s specification, ¶ 0004). Thus, the claimed subject matter provides features and advantages not known or available in the cited prior art. Consequently, the cited prior art will not support a rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and *Graham*. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 16 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites:

A program storage system readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program, applet, or instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device, the method comprising:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker.

(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Kori and Chen do not teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim

24. Specifically, as amply demonstrated above, Kori and Chen fail to teach or suggest “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.”

(Claim 24).

Again, under the analysis required by *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966) to support a rejection under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art must first be determined, followed by an assessment of the differences between the prior art and the claim at issue in view of the ordinary skill in the art. The Supreme Court has recently reaffirmed that the *Graham* factors “continue to define the inquiry that controls” obviousness rejections under § 103. *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). In the present case, the scope and content of the prior art, as evidenced by Kori and Chen, did not include the claimed subject matter, particularly “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that

the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed.” (Claim 24).

The differences between the cited prior art and the claimed subject matter are significant because the claimed subject matter automatically fits a video feed to a display device without having to store nondisplayed portions of the video feed. (See Applicant’s specification, ¶ 0004). Thus, the claimed subject matter provides features and advantages not known or available in the cited prior art. Consequently, the cited prior art will not support a rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and *Graham*. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 24 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Additionally, various dependent claims of the application recite subject matter that is further patentable over the cited prior art. Specific, non-exclusive examples follow.

Claims 4, 19, and 27:

Claim 4 recites “wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.” Similarly, claim 19 recites “wherein the means for ascertaining at least one marker includes means for fixing the at least one marker for each video feed,” and claim 27 recites “wherein ascertaining at least one marker includes fixing the at least one marker for each video feed.” Accordingly, claims 4, 19, and 27 teach that instead of parsing out the at least one marker from the video feed, the marker may be alternatively ascertained by having a fixed marker for each video feed. (See Applicant’s specification, ¶ 0034).

Regarding this subject matter, the Action cites to the video ID encoder taught by Kori. (Action, p. 3). However, nowhere does Kori teach or suggest that the video ID encoder fixes

a marker for each video feed. Rather, Kori appears to only teach that a marker is added to a video stream dynamically by the video ID encoder in response to a microcomputer's determination as to whether the aspect ratios of the input video signal and the consumer of an output video signal coincide. (Kori, col. 4, lines 5-31). Moreover, Chen does not teach or suggest encoding such a marker in the video signal at all. Consequently, since Kori and Chen fail to teach or suggest this subject matter, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for claims 4, 19, and 27. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 4, 19, and 27 should be reconsidered and withdrawn under *Graham*.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments in future papers supporting the patentability of any of the claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the

Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: June 5, 2009

/Steven L. Nichols/
Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066
(801) 572-7666 (fax)